C. L. Copy

SEPTEMBER 1961

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 13

5

THE CONTINUING CRISIS

THE EDITORS

THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

OFFICERS OF THE ILWU

Cuba and the U. S. CHE GUEVARA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME THIRTEEN NUMBER FIVE SEPTEMBER 1961

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Continuing Crisis 193
A NEW DEATH VALLEY by Jeanne Riha 205
FASCISM AND SCHIZOPHRENIA: A COMMUNICATION by *Philip Reno*.. 210
THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT by Officers of the ILWU 213
CUBA AND THE U.S. by Che Guevara 222
A PREVIEW OF HISTORY? by James Higgins 225
A DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE by American Artists and Writers 230
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 232

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1961, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-8403.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One Year—$5; two years—$9.
By 1st class mail—United States $7; everywhere else $8.
By air mail—No. America $9; So. America $14; Europe $18; Asia and Africa $24.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Generally speaking, things slow down during the summer, but the season just passed was an exception. MR Press was busy with two new books, *Guerrilla Warfare* and *From Yalta to Disarmament*. We hurried production on the latter book so it would get out before the scheduled debate on disarmament opened at the U.N. this month. Those of you who have read it know how much useful background information it contains—why not ask your library to purchase it so more people can understand what's going on when the debate begins?

We were busy, too, filling orders for our July-August double issue which still continues in demand. Newsstand sales were particularly gratifying, exceeded only by the sales of last year's *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution*. We are back on the press with a third printing of that paperback book and second and third printings have already come out in Cuba, Brazil, England, and Japan. A publishing house in Uruguay is bringing out a Spanish edition for the other Latin-American countries.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONTINUING CRISIS

It is now 16 years since the end of World War II, and the status of Germany remains as unsettled as it was in the summer of 1945. The Soviet government is calling for an end to this situation on the basis of the acceptance by all concerned of the territorial and political *status quo,* i.e. the division of Germany into two states which are both here to stay. The *form* of this acceptance could undoubtedly vary within wide limits; in this respect the ingenuity of diplomacy would not be found wanting. But on the essential matter of content, the requirements of a settlement are given by the nature of the situation itself: East Germany would have to be recognized as a normal state having defined boundaries and effective sovereignty within them. Let that happen, or even let a serious step in that direction be taken, and the present crisis would disappear at once.

There are two major problems involved in recognition. One is East Germany's eastern boundary, the other is Berlin. The United States and Britain accepted the Oder-Neisse line *de facto* at Potsdam in the summer of 1945, and France has since made her acceptance official. In addition, it is the actual international line of demarcation between East Germany and Poland. What would now be required, therefore, would be merely a positive declaration of recognition from Washington, London, and especially Bonn. No new arrangements are called for.

Berlin is not so simple. The problem here is *not* that West Berlin is a self-governing enclave within East German territory. There is nothing particularly unusual about such enclaves within fully sovereign states. The trouble in Berlin is that the western part of the city is an enclave under outside military protection which claims the right to, and actually does, violate the essential attributes of East German sovereignty. Among these attributes of sovereignty is jurisdiction over immigration and emigration. At the present time, East Germany has no control over air traffic to and from West Berlin (nor has the Soviet Union either, for that matter). Since people can move relatively freely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between East Berlin and the rest of East Germany on the one hand, and between East Berlin and West Berlin on the other, this means that the East German government does not have even nominal control over the movement of people to and from its territory. To illustrate by an analogy, it is as though people, in addition to being able to visit UN headquarters in New York without let or hindrance, could also fly in and out without any regard to the laws of the United States or agreements governing relations between the United States and the UN. Since no country in the world guards its jurisdiction over immigration and emigration more jealously than the United States, one can readily imagine the reaction of the American government, and no doubt also of the American people, to such a gross infringement of the nation's sovereignty.

This example indicates the kind of new arrangements that would be needed in Berlin. There would be no question of putting an end to West Berlin's status as a self-governing enclave, but the movement of people and goods between West Berlin and the rest of the world would have to come under the terms of an agreement between the government of West Berlin and the government of East Germany. These terms, in turn, would have to be drawn up in such a way as to protect the vital interests of both parties. Without attempting to spell out the appropriate provisions, we can say that the main things from the West Berlin point of view are self-government, freedom to come and go, and freedom of trade; while from the East German point of view the crux of the matter is simply to be guaranteed against the use of West Berlin as a center of hostile activities (spying, subversive propaganda, escape route for refugees, and so on). It should not be too difficult to draw up the terms of such an agreement. More trouble would be likely to arise in connection with its enforcement, since West Berliners, for obvious reasons, have no confidence in the good will of the East German authorities. Here international guarantees and machinery are called for. A particularly attractive proposal, it seems to us, would be to transfer headquarters of the UN from New York to West Berlin and to have the status of the city defined by an agreement between the UN and East Germany, just as the status of the present headquarters in New York is defined by an agreement between the UN and the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is little doubt that a settlement along these lines—acceptance of the Oder-Neisse line and a status for West Berlin consistent with East German sovereignty—would be satisfactory to the Soviet Union and its allies. Of course there are other things they would like to get too: formal diplomatic recognition of East Germany, military neutralization of a zone in Central Europe along lines proposed several years ago in the Rapacki Plan, etc. Steps of this sort would consolidate the *status quo* in Europe and strengthen the barriers against a new German *Drang nach Osten;* but they have none of the urgency that attaches to the main issue. That issue, to put the matter in its most elementary terms, is to get the West to accept the outcome of World War II as final and irrevocable. Once that is done, negotiations looking to further agreements would be logical and indeed desirable from the point of view of all the parties at interest. But the prior condition is essential, and it is this first step that Khrushchev is now trying to push the Western powers into taking.

But why, it may be asked, all the urgency? Why is Khrushchev in such a hurry? Doesn't he believe that history is on the side of the socialist countries? And if that is so, won't they be in a stronger position to raise the Berlin question three or five or ten years from now than they are today?

The trouble with the reasoning implicit in such questions as these is that it applies an abstract, long-range view of history to a very specific and immediate problem. Berlin *is* what Khrushchev calls a "bone in the throat," not only of East Germany but of the whole socialist bloc. The bloc is moving toward integrated planning and development; and East Germany as one of the most highly industrialized areas, is being assigned a role which is not only important now but destined to become more important in the years ahead as the bloc assumes larger and larger obligations toward the underdeveloped countries. A striking indication of this role can be gathered from some extremely interesting statistics recently published by the UN Economic Commission for Europe on world trade in steel. From 1950 to 1959, total exports of steel products from the Soviet Union rose from 646,000 to 2,714,000 metric tons. During the same period, East Germany's share went up from 85,000 to 1,082,000 metric tons, or from 13 percent to 40 percent of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

total!* It can hardly be expected that the USSR will sit quietly by while East Germany chokes on the Berlin bone. This may not be quite what is happening today, but the exaggeration is not extreme. The flow of refugees from East to West Germany is a very serious matter, draining off population badly needed by the East German economy, and especially the best qualified younger workers and technicians who are educated and trained at public expense in East Germany and then defect to enjoy the higher salaries and emoluments offered by the still-prosperous West German economy. The psychological and political effects of the present situation are likewise damaging. The East German regime is driven to repressive measures in an effort to counteract the undermining of its economic strength, and this in turn heightens the pressure to emigrate, and so on in a vicious circle. East Germany today is probably the only country in the world of any importance in which population is actually declining. To put an end to all this, to "normalize" the life of East Germany, hence to improve the prospects of the whole bloc, *is* a matter of urgency.

Even this might not be decisive, however, if it weren't for the equally urgent problem of West Germany's military posture. There is not the slightest doubt about the will of West German ruling circles for full-scale rearmament, including the possession of atomic weapons. Nor will anyone who is at all familiar with the history of the last half century take at face value American assurances that there is no intention to equip West German forces with A-weapons. If things go on as at present, it is only a matter of time, and probably not very much time either, before West Germany takes a place as an atomic power. This is an eventuality which not only the Soviet Union but also the Poles and Czechs and Yugoslavs and indeed all the peoples of Europe have every reason to dread. But the only thing they can do about it is to effect a change in the direction of events before it is too late, to create a new situation in which new approaches to the German problem become possible. It is the purpose of Khrushchev's present German policy to bring about precisely such a change. On this we have the unquestionably authoritative report of

* Data republished in the *Bulletin of the Association for the Study of Soviet-Type Economies*, June 1961.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Walter Lippmann following his interview with Khrushchev earlier this year:

> It was clear to me at the end of a long talk that in Mr. K's mind the future of Germany is the key question. I sought first to understand why he thinks the German problem is so urgent, and so I asked him whether, since agreement was so far off, a standstill of five or ten years might not be desirable. He said this was impossible. Why? Because there must be a German solution before "Hitler's generals with their 12 NATO divisions" get atomic weapons from France and the United States. Before this happens there must be a peace treaty defining the frontiers of Poland and Czechoslovakia and stabilizing the existence of the East German state. Otherwise, West Germany will drag NATO into a war for the unification of Germany and the restoration of the old eastern frontiers.

Let us turn now to an analysis of United States policy. For propaganda and public relations purposes, the attitude of the Western powers is one of injured innocence. Everything is quiet and peaceful in Berlin, Mr. Kennedy tells us, and we are willing to leave it that way, even though we would prefer to see Germany "united in freedom" (which means to see West Germany swallow up East Germany). The Soviet Union is quite arbitrarily and unjustifiably stirring up trouble. Our policy in the face of this aggressive behavior is to stand on our rights which, as everyone agrees, stem from Germany's surrender in World War II. So much for the "image" which Washington wishes to present to the world. What are the presuppositions and calculations that lie behind it?

United States leaders know as well as Khrushchev that the present situation cannot last forever. They are also fully aware that a change is urgently desired by the Soviet Union and that failure to reach an agreement could lead to a war which could be disastrous to all concerned. Still they show absolutely no sign of budging. Why?

At least four sets of reasons would seem to be involved which, for want of better labels, we can discuss under the following headings: (1) the historic trend; (2) fear of break-up of the cold war alliance; (3) the need for international tension; and (4) what may be called a developing Samson complex. Let us consider them in turn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) *The Historic Trend.* That "history is on our side" was a major article of faith of the late John Foster Dulles. Communism, in his view, was a system which violates human nature and hence must sooner or later break up and disappear. The correct course for the capitalist countries ("free world") is therefore clear: to stand firm and to apply maximum pressure to hasten the disintegrative process. Washington's present German policy follows this formula to the letter. No concessions of any kind to the Soviet point of view have been suggested, and Berlin has been and is being used to the hilt to weaken East Germany and through it the whole socialist bloc. Are we to assume that this argument from supposed historical inevitability is really behind present Western policy?

So far as the Adenauer leadership in West Germany is concerned, the answer is probably in the affirmative. Adenauer and Dulles saw eye to eye when Dulles was alive, and there is no reason to assume that Adenauer has in any way changed. A letter to the *New York Times* (July 17) from a prominent member of Adenauer's political party sums up the official West German view as follows:

> It is not true that we have to choose today between the permanent partition of Germany if the Federal Republic remains in NATO or the reunification of a free, neutralized, unified Germany outside NATO. In reality, the alternatives are that either a strong and unified West will succeed jointly with the Federal Republic in winning the cold war throughout the world, or that there will never be any possibility of restoring a free and secure Germany. . . . The closer, the more intimately, the more firmly the Federal Republic associates herself with her friends, the nearer will be the day of freedom for the whole of Europe.

"Winning the cold war throughout the world" and "freedom for the whole of Europe" are, of course, simply cold-war circumlocutions for the break-up of the socialist bloc and the decline of the Soviet Union to a state of impotence. As such, they accurately define the goals and aspirations of West German policy. But are these views of what is inevitable, or even merely possible, shared by Washington policymakers today?

We know of no evidence of it. There are, in fact, no ideologues among them of the Dulles stripe, none who have any strong convictions or beliefs of any kind. They are technicians,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operators, fixers. They have the adman's view of human nature, which amounts in practice to contempt for human nature: they believe that people can be manipulated and that almost any social system can be made to work if you only know how to pull the right levers. The more sophisticated among them are beginning to recognize not only the viability of a socialist planned economy but its inherent superiority to the chaotic capitalist economy. In their hearts, they know that in a few decades at most, if the world lasts that long, the socialist bloc will have overtaken and surpassed its capitalist rival. They certainly have no illusions about the imminent, or even ultimate, break-up of the socialist bloc and the decline of Soviet power. Though their German policy is indistinguishable from that of Dulles and Adenauer, it is simply impossible to believe that it rests on the same intellectual and ideological foundations. To understand it, we must turn to the other sets of reasons listed above.

(2) *Fear of Break-up of the Cold War Alliance.* The crucial factor here is West Germany. We have already noted that under Adenauer, West Germany has consistently followed the Dulles line of no compromise and maximum pressure in the belief that sooner or later the socialist bloc must disintegrate. Suppose now that Washington should decide to negotiate a German settlement with the USSR involving recognition of East Germany and a guarantee of the Oder-Neisse boundary. Clearly, the unreality of the Dulles conception would be exposed for all to see; and West German policy, presumably under Adenauer's successors, would have to undergo an "agonizing reappraisal." No one can say for sure what would happen next, but it is obvious that the cold war alliance could never be the same again. All the old rigidities and certitudes which have formed the backbone of United States policy for going on two decades would be dissolved; negotiating with the Soviet Union instead of fighting against it would become respectable; the bogey of imminent Soviet aggression would fade, and with it America's capacity to dominate the affairs of the continent. These, the reader will note, are precisely the elements of a recurring ruling-class nightmare which goes under some such title as "the shattering of Western unity." Far better, in the eyes of all but a small minority of Americans, to stand fast with Adenauer, to preserve the illusions of Dulles a while longer, to avoid as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long as possible facing up to the frightening realities of the changed international balance of power.

In addition to these fears and forebodings about the effect of a German settlement on America's international position, the ruling class of this country dreads any genuine let-up in the cold war itself. This brings us to the third set of reasons.

(3) *The Need for International Tension.* We have repeatedly emphasized in these pages the crucial role played by the cold war and the arms race in the functioning of the American economy and in propping up the present power structure of American society, and we need not elaborate on the theme here. Suffice it to remind the reader of two points: (a) The fact that today we have an unemployment rate of 6 to 7 percent of the civilian labor force instead of 15 to 25 percent as during the 1930's is due solely to "national defense" spending by the federal government of more than $40 billion a year. (b) The extremely effective system of thought control and political regimentation now in effect is built around and depends upon the dogmas of anti-Communism. It follows that any real relaxation of international tensions, any solid evidence that it is possible to coexist peacefully with the socialist bloc, would constitute a serious threat to the present secure, indeed unchallenged, position of the "power elite." Actually, with the American economy in a phase of creeping stagnation, what is now needed is more, not less, arms spending and hence more, not less, international tension. From this point of view a chronic Berlin crisis is made to order; while any reasonable German settlement would be little short of a disaster. *Nota Bene* that before the end of July, Kennedy had already given the Berlin crisis as a reason for asking the Congress to appropriate between three and four billion more dollars for armaments.

It might seem that by now we have all the explanation we need for Washington's adamant stand against a German settlement, and no doubt this is the case. Nevertheless, there is a further element in the present situation which works in the same direction and which can be ignored only at the risk of seriously misjudging what lies ahead. We refer to the deepening mood of despair which is engulfing the American ruling class and which is visibly giving rise to what may be called a "Sam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son complex"—a preference for universal ruin to the victory of a rival social order. Let us consider this more closely.

(4) *The Samson Complex.* It is likely that the beneficiaries of declining social systems have always looked upon their approaching demise as the ultimate disaster for humanity. At any rate, hopeless wars in defense of outworn institutions have been common enough in the history of civilizations; and in this sense the attitudes and behavior of the American ruling class in the present juncture follow a pattern which is familiar, not least from our own historical experience. Staughton Lynd makes the point well in a recent issue of *Committee of Correspondence* (June 19):

> Here the appropriate comparison is to the mood of the slaveholders of the South on the eve of the Civil War. They were not belligerent because the slave economy was increasingly unprofitable, as neo-Marxists like Louis Hacker have suggested: on the contrary, historians now think that slavery in the 1850's enjoyed relatively flush times. The leaders of the Southern states contemplated war because they felt slavery as a system of economy and society was losing ground before the expanding capitalism of the North. As the territories of the American West became states, the political balance of the Union shifted steadily toward the North, just as in the United Nations now the entrance of underdeveloped nations threatens American supremacy. Southerners then perceived that not only the United States but also Latin America and Europe were inexorably discarding a system based on bondage and moving over into a contractual society. They saw and saw correctly, that time was against them. Unwilling to face the one possible alternative to violence—the voluntary abolition of slavery in the South—they made ready for war.
>
> The essence of the attitude of such a ruling group *in extremis* is despair. "Slavery," Allan Nevins writes, had become "synonymous with Despair." And for the men who fashion American decisions today, one suspects that talk of New Frontiers overcompensates for an inner lack of faith in the future performance of the American economy. Despair, which at its finest prompts a high-souled stoicism, in most men leads to the "fire-eating" aggressiveness which stamps the American statesmen of the world of 1960 just as it marked the Southern leader in the United States of 1860.

It would have been inappropriate, a hundred years ago, to speak of a Samson complex since the Southern ruling class,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though it may have had the will certainly lacked the power to encompass the destruction of its enemies. But this is no longer true today: the American ruling class by all accounts has many more than enough A and H-bombs to wipe out all the cities in the socialist countries while at the same fatally poisoning the earth's atmosphere. And when President Kennedy, by no means an extreme "fire-eater" among American statesmen, says, as he did to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April, that he is "determined upon our system's survival and success, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril," can there be any doubt that he is announcing the intention of the United States to destroy the world rather than allow it to adopt another system?

The vision of reality which underlies the Samson complex, it should be noted, is not only different from but diametrically opposite to that which inspired the policies of John Foster Dulles. Dulles, in his own way, was an optimist. Time and history were on his side. He had only to survive to win. Kennedy is under no such illusions. Time and history are on the side of his enemies. He can survive only by arresting their course, and this he must do "regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril." But in spite of these differences, the two views lead in practice to identical policies. Neither leaves room for negotiation, accommodation, compromise. Both lead inevitably to the taking of absolute stands, to do-or-die declarations, to eternal brinkmanship.

We have here, it seems to us, at least a partial explanation of one of the most puzzling paradoxes of recent American history, namely, how it came about that on the decisive international issues, the Kennedy administration has reverted to the policies of Dulles rather than seeking to resume and develop further the tentative steps away from Dullesism that were taken by Eisenhower in the last phase of his administration. Nowhere is this paradox more strikingly evident than in the case of Berlin. After Khrushchev's visit to the United States in October, 1959, we wrote in these pages (November 1959, pp. 226-227):

The joint communique issued after the Camp David talks, plus certain supplementary remarks by both Eisenhower and Khrushchev, have led to the widespread impression that the basis of a settlement of the Berlin problem had been laid along the following

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lines: Western forces would remain in Berlin, perhaps under a UN label and with suitable guarantees of access. In return, the West would interpose no objection to the Soviet Union's signing a separate peace treaty with East Germany. This procedure would constitute a tacit recognition of the existence and legitimacy of the East German regime and would presumably be followed in due course by a more formal arrangement, leading eventually to a *de jure* and *de facto* acceptance by the United States of the *status quo* in Central and Eastern Europe. . . . If this really becomes Western policy on Germany, there can be no doubt that it would constitute a very significant step forward. It would in fact be the first real break with the Dulles policy of refusing to negotiate any settlements, stepping up the cold war, and waiting for the supposedly inevitable break-up of the Soviet bloc.

Needless to say, it did not become Western policy on Germany. Eisenhower was almost immediately subjected to overwhelming pressures against further negotiation, culminating in the U-2 affair and the collapse of the summit meeting which was supposed to deal with the German problem. Nevertheless, Eisenhower had taken what might have become a highly significant first step, provided the Kennedy administration wanted to venture further along the same path. The question is why it refused to follow Eisenhower's lead but instead reverted to a policy of intransigence which Dulles himself could hardly have improved upon. If our analysis is correct, no small part of the answer lies in the basic similarity of the conclusions which flow from the Dulles brand of apocalyptic optimism and the New Frontiersmen's Samson complex. To both, compromise is worse than futile; it is simply a defeat which invites bigger defeats in the future. To both, the sum and substance of true statesmanship is the same: stand firm—and blow up the world if necessary.

We are not suggesting that the time has yet come when the American ruling class is seriously considering blowing up the world. Samson, it will be remembered, acted in revenge for the Philistines' putting out his eyes. So far, at any rate, the American ruling class has not been badly hurt and is not prepared to contemplate suicide. Moreover, the truth is that in terms of material interests it has nothing to lose from accepting the existing state of affairs in Central and Eastern Europe, provided

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only that it is not done in such a way as to relax tensions and undercut the armaments economy.

For all these reasons, it seems likely that in the months ahead the German policy of the Kennedy administration will be of a sort to maintain tensions while avoiding war. The USSR will probably sign a peace treaty with East Germany; but nothing will be settled, and a fertile soil for future crises will be carefully preserved. Some time in the future, when the decline and fall of the American empire is further advanced, one of these recurring crises may indeed provide a despairing American ruling class with the "justification" for pulling down the temple in which we must all dwell, saints and sinners alike. In the meantime, they will do their part to keep international tensions up to the required pitch.

(August 12, 1961)

Of the many causes I prefer not to die for I should give priority to the reunification of Germany. I believe I am speaking for the overwhelming majority of British people when I say that the one clearly good result of two world wars is the permanent division of the Reich. If you talk to Germans themselves, you find that few really desire unification; it is mainly Adenauer's party propaganda. Anyway, it can't be brought about without a third world war because the Russians can no more agree to East Germany becoming part of NATO than the West can allow West Germany to become part of the Communist bloc. Yet there seems a fair chance that we shall all be vaporized because the public, especially in America, is not told East Germany must be a party to Berlin negotiations.

—*Critic, New Statesman, August 4, 1961*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEW DEATH VALLEY

BY JEANNE RIHA

On the grassy slopes of Southern California's beautiful Conejo valley the industries of war are setting up shop.

Nowhere could there be a less appropriate setting. The 780-foot Conejo summit looks west across a scenic green plain to the Pacific. To the east it slopes down into a semi-rural valley of rolling hills that once were only cattle and grain land.

Until 1959 the valley's main signs of life were a country school, a horse ranch, a home for the aged, a boarding academy, some half-hearted commercial development, scattered homes and farm buildings, and one prophetic aircraft and missile parts manufacturer. Now the landscape is scarred by blocks of standardized tract homes and the new industries of death.

They squat in fashionably modern buildings on tastefully landscaped sites that were leveled from the knolls of a former ranch. In the promotional literature this Conejo site is described as a "prestige location for electronics, light manufacturing or similar uses." So far, the new industries are dominantly military or semi-military, as they are throughout the county of Ventura. A major drawing card for the electronics industry is the nearby Pacific Missile Range headquarters which claimed a 1961 investment of $222.2 million compared with $68.9 million in 1957. One company, Raytheon, which does electronics and missile test work, even built a plant near the naval missile test station.

Manufacturing has developed slowly in the county to supplement the older sources of revenue—oil and agriculture. "Ordnance and accessories" now rank first among the county's manufactures, and in the Conejo this trend is intensified.

New research and manufacturing companies include Packard Bell Electronics which makes specialized products for the aircraft industry and does government contract work; Technological Instrument Corporation which turns out electronic com-

---

Miss Riha is a free-lance journalist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ponents for the missile and aircraft industry and for commercial users; and a Westinghouse Astroelectronics laboratory serving military services and the defense industry, and producing devices for space vehicles, missiles, and aircraft. Northrup Corporation will build a plant for its Radioplane Division to make target surveillance drone systems for the armed services and to engage in space projects.

Responsible for bringing the new companies to the Conejo is the Janss Investment Corporation. Operating as sort of a private county planning agency, Janss has developed much residential and commercial property in the vicinity as well as the 894-acre "industrial park."

Brothers William and Edwin Janss are generally treated with the deference reserved for Juan Cabrillo, the Portuguese explorer who opened the Ventura area to the white man in 1542. They received, jointly, the "outstanding citizen" award of the local Chamber of Commerce in January 1961. The award was appropriately bestowed on them by the command pilot of the neighboring Oxnard Air Force Base who praised the "wonderful transformation" of the region from "a comparatively uninhabited area which begged people to partake of its natural beauty and promise for a good life to what it is today—an area growing gracefully from ranch to metropolis."

An industrial promoter from nearby San Fernando valley also extended greetings and advice. He urged more industry, pointing out bluntly: "In your immediate vicinity there are more prime contractors in the missile field than in any other spot in the United States."

The new military industries already have ambitious plans for expansion, and a Janss spokesman has pledged that when the entire "industrial park" is filled, more industrial acreage will be needed in the valley. About half the industrial site has been sold. Each new industrial employee, he pointed out, will need about 10 persons to service his family's needs. And so the area will grow, industries and services complementing each other in providing jobs and income for a booming population.

A twenty-year forecast by a reputable research organization saw a ten-fold increase in manufacturing for the county by 1980. It asserted: "With its close proximity to the Los Angeles electronics, missile, research and development industries, the county

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will benefit from the expansion in those lines. The early beginning of this trend is already in evidence."

There are, of course, a few weaknesses in these plans. If the county continues to rely on military development for its manufacturing growth, it will become extremely vulnerable to progress in disarmament. Should disarmament remain a dream, as seems more likely, the area will inevitably be forced into the role of spokesman for the military.

Already it serves something of this purpose since Ventura county also hosts three military installations: the Pacific Missile Range headquarters and allied facilities at Point Mugu, a Naval Construction Battalion Center at Port Hueneme, and an air force base. The local press scrupulously quotes the military chieftains whenever they hiccough, and newspaper readers are regularly reminded that "defense is big business" for the county. But the growth of military manufacturing is even more significant. It will firmly knit together the interests of industry, the military, local commercial elements such as realtors and subdividers who benefit from the industry, and the supporting citizenry.

What is emerging is a county economy based on production for death. This is especially depressing since the agricultural economy has been historically one of production for life. Even today, with huge chunks of farmland being urbanized, Ventura remains the biggest lemon-producing county in the nation and the sixteenth ranking county in the value of its agricultural products.

Recently another military producer, the Kellogg division of American Brake Shoe Co., moved into a huge new building that stands on former vegetable land in the west part of the county. Kellogg manufactures, besides some non-military items, hydraulic equipment for aircraft and missiles. Kellogg came in to occupy a vacant building that had been erected by another military manufacturer, Permanent Filter Corp., which later decided the location was too far from its Los Angeles markets some 65 miles away. On this rich soil which once gave three crops a year of varied vegetables in one of the finest growing climates in the world, Kellogg now puts out hydraulic equipment for military aircraft and North American's Hound Dog missile.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The lethal aspects of the burgeoning new industry are studiously ignored by most local boosters. An occasional county official or candidate for office remarks that the area should not become overly dependent on the military, but that usually ends the discussion. The military manufacturers are praised for paying over-average salaries and the employees for being "good civic-minded citizens," as many of them are in off-duty hours. In Oxnard, the urban hub of the military bases, 6000 jobs were traced in 1959 to the Seabee base and the naval missile center, and only 5200 jobs were attributed to commerce and civilian industry.

In the special press editions that celebrate the area's growth and prosperity, the military bases and industries take their place alongside the producers of community wealth. The military manufacturers do not produce for death; they "actively participate in national defense activities." The Missile Mrs. share the society page with other women's clubs.

Missile parts companies are sold to the community beforehand with enthusiastic accounts of the "revolutionary design" of their architecture; size of the payroll; estimates of annual sales; the "campus-like surroundings"; the noiseless, smokeless, odorless factories. The trained technicians are described as assets to the community.

The Talley Corporation, electronics pioneer in the Conejo, was hailed in a promotional newspaper supplement as "an ideal place to work," a place where recorded music spurred on the missile makers and noise was kept to a minimum. The company's "expanding" operations in the manufacture of actuators and air valves for military aircraft and missiles offered work to "skilled mechanics, design and test, mechanical, electrical, pneumatic engineers, general office and production office personnel."

An announced purpose of the Kellogg division is to become "a better neighbor in the community." Packard Bell proclaims it has assembled in its Conejo plant "a force of scientists, engineers, and technicians dedicated to the motto 'Engineering Beyond the Expected,' " surely a choice understatement of the missile age.

Both industry and community are engaged in a highly successful endeavor to pass off the war producers as just another valuable economic enterprise. Some of the most humane

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizens in the nation work on these instruments of death, but they sharply separate their business from their personal lives. They leave their computers at day's end to raise funds for the county's "liberal" church or to work on genuinely needed community projects. All the efforts of community and "free enterprise" go into perpetuating the separation of their lives and into destroying any twinges of social conscience. Personal responsibility here, as in many other areas of American life, is never allowed to rear its ugly head.

MR PRESS

PAMPHLET PACKET $2.00

Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	15¢ per copy	7 for $1	40 for $5
Marxian Socialism; and *Power Elite or Ruling Class?* by Sweezy	35¢ per copy	3 for $1	20 for $5
Waste in American Medicine by a Committee of Physicians	35¢ per copy	3 for $1	20 for $5
The Theory of U.S. Foreign Policy by Sweezy and Huberman	35¢ per copy	3 for $1	20 for $5
Marxism and Psychoanalysis by Baran Comments and Rejoinder	50¢ per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5
Reflections on the Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	50¢ per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5
The ABC of Socialism by Huberman and May	50¢ per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5
Thinkers and Treasurers by Dunham	50¢ per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5

The list price of the pamphlets is $3.20. The special price of all of them together is only

$2.00

Send your order for the Pamphlet Packet, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FASCISM AND SCHIZOPHRENIA: A COMMUNICATION

BY PHILIP RENO

The following communication from an MR reader raises and attempts in part to answer some of the most important questions facing this country today. We invite other readers to submit their answers.—The Editors

"Let me ask you something now. Don't you think that the United States is marching toward fascism?" Fidel Castro's question, asked of American correspondents during the Tractor Committee's visit to Cuba, must have been worrying quite a bit of the world lately.

"Amidst deadly silence," according to the undoubtedly jazzed-up report in the *New York Times,* "a correspondent took it upon himself to deliver a long explanation of the American tradition of democracy, of America's faith in her free institutions, and of the instinctive reaction of the American society against any inroads in its liberties."

Assume, heeding kindness' counsel, that the correspondent was not simply ignorant; assume that he knew about, and just did not think significant, the deepening erosion of America's free institutions and liberties. Surely Cubans, at any rate, know the distressing facts, and so the correspondent's unconcern with attacks on the liberties he talked about may have given Fidel an indirect answer to his question. And yet it would be useful to have a direct, reasoned answer—some analysis of the forces promoting and restraining fascism in the United States.

This is certainly the year of burgeoning American fascism. Who ever heard of John Birch, or Robert Welch, before 1961? Even the flabby fascist hacks of years gone by have taken on new life in this year's atmosphere. To be sure, the Birch Society is made up of well-to-do, not mill-run, maniacs; and theirs is a back-door, clandestine intervention in events. Ties with the Republican Party give this intervention some effect, and there is another tie that has pulled the Birch Society into prominence. This tie is with the United States Army.

The Army's civilian education program, and no little of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

staff indoctrination, is built around Birch or Birch-like projects—films, pamphlets, lectures, "seminars," all the standard propaganda media of Birch activity. The Army's commitment can be seen more clearly yet in the role of retired army officers in actual Birch Society organization. Nearly every sizeable community, and certainly every pleasant area, in America has been infiltrated by these brash, time-free, conniving would-be American Eichmanns. They are at the center of Birch Society organization.

Whether the fascist organizations, now a serious menace only in our schools, will move on to widespread political demonstration and violence—this is the question. And so to the irrational factor it raises.

Why, to introduce this factor, why would the American power elite, or ruling class, want any change in what they have now? What could be sweeter, for them, than the unchallenged privileges they now enjoy? Here they inhabit, and run, a society dedicated to their values; a society in which labor and intellectuals vie to serve them politically and often personally; where they can, almost without domestic restraint, devote the American state and American industrial potential to world exploitation. The rest of the world is not, understandably, so tractable, and here indeed some differences about ways and means arise—whether to spend more or less for propaganda and "welfare," for instance; but always agreeing to spend the maximum on overdeveloped armies in the underdeveloped lands.

Why then the growing demand for change? Why not simply tighten the police-state noose? Why turn to a new, fanatic machine to run the state?

The only possible reason, I suggest, is that increasing numbers of the American big bourgeoisie, and their military and political henchmen, actually believe the fantastic tales they spread. They live increasingly, not in the real world, but in the world of fantasy they have invented and which they propagate —the frightening world of "Communist threat" and "Communist penetration" and "Communist encirclement." This schizophrenia, this paranoid schizophrenia, of growing numbers of important Americans has become a major social force.

A good many of us have taken it for granted that the right-wing spokesmen, J. Edgar Hoover and the Un-American Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittee members and the others, expound their incredible nonsense solely as political propaganda, knowing it to be false. Did anyone imagine that Welch and his associates really believe that the Eisenhower brothers are communist dupes? Or that the army officers who show "Communism on the Map" think for a minute that England and France and the Scandinavian countries are actually Communist? Or that the CIA does not know that the Cuban goblins and dragons it claims to see are not really there? It is all so ludicrous; and coming from cynical politicians, and others not even clowns but dullards, how could anyone think they mean it? So one tended to ignore the mania that has taken over many of their minds.

This paranoia may well be the most pervasive factor in American political life today. Even saner Americans, Adlai Stevenson for example, base their every counsel on the madman's world of threatening Communist figures lurking behind happenings that are in fact simple and obvious. Behind the demands of starving people for an end to their misery are seen the machinations of Cuban and Chinese and of course Russian agents. Venal politicians we buy and sell, and brutal police we arm and train, become defenders of liberty and the American way of life. Not cynically, not with tongue in cheek—here's the frightening thing—but in glazed, intense conviction. More and more American minds are passing across the psychotic threshold.

The organization of this mass paranoia is the fascist role. The inevitable outcome of fascist success is war. Without fascism, it should be possible to avoid a nuclear war; in fact, war's likelihood derives from insanity—not insanity in the abstract way that many of us have thought of war, but in clinically unmistakable mental derangement of those in power.

We're not there yet, of course. Only a minority of our officials are yet ready to jump after Forrestal, screaming that the Russians are coming. But primarily we're not there yet because fascist mass organization is only getting underway.

What should be done then? What can we do? It's surely time to try and think out what the fascist thing amounts to here, at present and as potential, and to take whatever steps we can to meet it. The beginning is to understand; toward this understanding I hope that MONTHLY REVIEW will make whatever contribution it can in coming issues.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

BY OFFICERS OF THE ILWU

THE SITUATION

A union movement that no longer challenges the domination which the owners of industry have over the lives of working people has departed from the path of progress.

This is the condition in which the American labor movement finds itself today. Without confidence in the power of the rank and file and lacking any independent ideals, goals, or perspective, the present leaders of the AFL-CIO see little else but hopelessness and frustration before them.

Instead of challenging the *status quo* and fighting for the security and the dignity which our enormously rich economy and our democratic institutions can readily provide for all the American people, the present leaders of labor have set out to accommodate the labor movement to things as they are in the United States today. There are no more vocal or enthusiastic supporters of the *status quo* than these junior partners of mid-century American capitalism, and in abdicating their responsibilities as leaders of labor they have not only grievously weakened and impaired the fighting capacity of the labor movement, they have also seriously undermined the aspirations of the majority of the American people as well.

The labor movement came into being because working people recognized that the standard of living could be improved and the democratic decencies could be expanded only by their own unified and organized strength under militant, aggressive leadership.

Over the past 75 years, as these principles were followed, labor helped transform the face of America. It was because unions fought for and won power, and used this power in a responsible and constructive way, that the labor movement was

---

This is a section of the Report of the Officers to the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union held in Hawaii during April 1961. It is published here by permission.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to make such great changes in the United States. It still holds true today; there cannot be necessary changes unless there is a new acquisition of power by the working people and the responsible use of it in the interest of all.

Principles Unsensed, Unvoiced

Yet today the leaders of labor neither sense nor give voice to these hard-won principles. On the contrary, George Meany expresses a more complete acceptance of American business goals, standards, and attitudes than any top leader before him. Even Samuel Gompers, who set the labor movement on the path of getting maximum benefits for the workers within the existing framework of things sixty years ago, never contended that before labor could get a bigger slice of the pie the workers had the initial responsibility of making the pie itself bigger. Today this is the theory which guides the thinking of the present AFL-CIO leaders.

Is anyone more conservative than the labor leaders who see the present stage of development of the economic order as the ultimate and most perfect of arrangements? They have forgotten, if they ever knew, that these human institutions are simply a means toward an end—the "common good." They are willing to accept the right of businessmen to control their economic opportunities and their profit prospects, but they refuse to fight for the right of workers to control their employment opportunities and their job security.

Can a labor movement hold up its head when it accepts a system and rests the job security of its members on an irrational rat race in which "people buy things from one another that they do not want, at prices they cannot afford, on terms they cannot meet, because of advertising they cannot believe?"

As American industry becomes rapidly transformed by new techniques of production and moves into new communities and areas, the labor movement finds itself declining in size, significance, and influence. New organizing is practically at a standstill. Jurisdictional disputes along with endless squabbles about the "ownership" of already organized workers plague labor. Each year that passes finds organized labor representing a smaller and smaller part of the labor force.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cold War at Root

Bankrupt of new ideas or approaches to the changing American working class, the labor leadership falters from one defensive position to another. Having long ago sold out the economic independence of the movement, they now find themselves wedded to an administration in power which, at this date, has shown no intention of being directly influenced by the labor movement or for that matter of turning to the rank and file of labor for the power to put across its policies as Franklin Delano Roosevelt so deliberately did in the Thirties.

The men who lead the AFL-CIO today, as individuals, are in most ways no better and no worse than their predecessors. Then what explains the sorry mess in which the movement now finds itself? The explanation lies in the all-out, unqualified support of the economic system at home and of the Cold War policies abroad.

Who Can Count Cost?

Once the labor movement took on the Cold War as its first priority, the outcome was inevitable. When the CIO under Phil Murray became a pathetic camp follower of the Truman Administration and imposed a political loyalty test and a screening program upon its affiliates, the retreat was on its way. Unions which refused to toe the line were expelled. The welfare and interests of the rank and file were buried with their local autonomy and their right to vote CIO policy up or down. As the differences between the AFL and CIO withered away, the merger of the two organizations became inevitable. Twelve years of retreat have since followed. We in the ILWU foretold it all in 1949.

It is no news that today there are few in America who are more unrestrained Cold War warriors than the top leaders of AFL-CIO. They have cheapened the offices they hold and reduced themselves to second class citizens and upstarts, by anxiously trying to prove that they are more loyal and more respectable and more patriotic than anyone else. This is not the place to draw up a detailed balance sheet of the profits and losses to the ranks of labor as a result of the espousal of the cause of the Cold War by labor's leaders. Who can count the costs of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizing that never took place, the gains never won, the campaigns for civil rights or for peace and disarmament never mounted?

The real harm of the Cold War crusade is to be found in the deadly effectiveness with which it diverted the labor movement from its hopes to its fears. The rank and file has been steadily robbed of the capacity to realize what its own ability places within reach. And toward what end? A leading Quaker spokesman, Stewart Meacham, recently pointed out that

> There is no security in the Cold War, but only ever greater hazard. When workers are told to sacrifice their economic powers for the sake of the security the Cold War can bring the nation, they are really being asked to sacrifice their own interests in the pursuit of a course which has led us ever deeper into areas of deadly peril.

The Cold War is a burden on the back of labor. The unions will never resume their rightful place of leadership in American life until they once more become "the instruments of justice in a world of peace."

THE RESULTS

The present state of affairs has prevented the labor movement from coming forward with an independent trade union program to meet the immediate and long-run needs of the American people.

Job security to meet the layoffs from the economic recession and automation is the most urgent problem today. There are more people out of work than at any time since the Great Depression of the Thirties; in some local unions anywhere from 25 to 50 percent of the membership is unemployed.

A recession means privation and hardship for those thrown out of work. For those workers still employed, a recession adds up to reduced earnings, more job insecurity, more stubborn collective bargaining, and a tougher job of enforcing the agreement on the job.

The management ideal for collective bargaining these days is the General Electric-IUE or the United Aircraft-UAW, IAM pattern. In both cases the corporations laid down the terms of settlement *before* the bargaining got underway, refused to budge throughout the negotiations, took a strike, continued to operate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with supervisors and scabs, and forced the strikers to return to work on the corporation's original terms. These successes have encouraged other employers to try the same tactics.

Meanwhile on the job, contract conditions have been deteriorating steadily. Fearing lay-off, employees are unable to resist speed-ups and hesitate to push grievances over violations of working rules. As unemployment and shorter work weeks spread, according to the *Wall Street Journal* of March 9, 1961, "efficiency of present workers grows . . . (and) job performance is improving."

"All I hear on the production line from 8:30 to 4:30," said one worker to the reporter, "is: 'Who's next to be laid off?' If you don't think that's making me work harder, I don't know what is."

It requires searching analysis and long-term planning to understand and to cope with an economic system which makes job seekers faster than it makes jobs, and which has created *more* unemployed at the peak of each successive prosperity since 1953.

But the present labor leaders find themselves as deeply attached and as dependent upon the present system as any stockbroker or Texas oil millionaire. In truth, they now find themselves locked into the same box—which they willingly and eagerly entered. And it is this state of affairs which in turn leads to accepting the kind of an analysis of the economy which asserts that

> High unemployment goes hand in hand with downward swings in the business cycle. It is one of the penalties that we pay for our dynamic free competitive enterprise system.
>
> Additional steps can be taken to smooth out the business cycle but, like death and taxes, it is going to stay with us. (Joseph R. Selvin, National Economic Editor, *New York Herald Tribune, January* 30, 1961.)

It is not surprising, therefore, that the labor leaders' response to the warnings of a "bleak outlook" and the "need for sacrifice" is a ready assent. When will they ask, "Why bleak?" and "Sacrifice for what?"

In the same manner in which economic proposals have been constrained and confined by the labor leaders' commitment to "winning" the Cold War and to preserving the economic order,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so has the necessity for rebuilding labor unity been frustrated by the priority given to these same goals.

Unity Is Touchstone

Labor unity is the touchstone of labor progress and achievement. A divided movement is not only a weakened movement, under the present circumstances it is a movement which is incapable of responding and acting. Conformity and business unionism will not end overnight if the movement becomes unified once more. But nothing can even begin to revitalize labor today except the spur of unionism—and unions which are still free-wheeling and still have the guts to fight, and which aren't afraid to call a spade a spade or to follow radical paths when these are called for. This is indispensable.

In the last analysis it is the rejection by the official labor movement of the initiative and the driving power that is set loose in building militant labor unity around specific trade union demands which is primarily responsible for the failure to meet the needs of the working people today.

Test Result Is Dismal

The shining hope which the CIO once was, under John L. Lewis, came about through no accident. It was because the CIO was a *rebel* organization which carried forward the spirit of the radicalism of the Thirties that it accomplished so much. There were no loyalty tests in those days except loyalty and dedication to advancing the welfare of the working people.

When we test the labor movement today by what it has to say and what it does on the key issues—jobs, democratic rights, reducing war tensions, disarmament, and building an independent political force—the result is a dismal one. Among other things this state of affairs has made it fashionable among liberals to write off the labor movement. Yet if a meaningful movement for social advance and social change is ever to come to America, it must be built in large part on the working people and their unions.

The rub is that so long as labor accepts the *status quo* in an evolving American capitalism, it accepts a diminishing role and influence on the American scene.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FAILURE TODAY

When we ask ourselves where and how the labor movement is falling down on its responsibilities today, and in what direction it must move to fulfill its traditional role in America, we recognize that the absence of any kind of a program for the "common good" of all the American people is critical. Under the Murray-Meany leadership the AFL and CIO became essentially business organizations. The men holding high office in labor are far less interested in *building* a labor movement than in conserving what they have and in getting a bit more. Above all they will not move into new areas which might jeopardize what they already have. Is it any wonder that unions are seen more and more as labor-selling, dues-collecting agencies?

The emphasis on "getting our cut" confirms the view that more and more people have of labor as a selfish interest group which does not speak for the common man or represent the common good. Younger workers seeking their first jobs and older workers too soon discarded, members of minority groups, small businessmen, and the great mass of unorganized workers in agriculture, the service trades and industry, resent organized labor as a hostile organization separated from them and their interests.

The sword of insurgence was first blunted on the rock of respectability at home; now it has been turned against labor's traditional goals abroad. A trade union movement which is content with the existing framework of economic institutions and relationships, can't be a beacon light of freedom and justice in the revolutionary world raging outside our nation's borders.

People Have Real Desire

Since the days of the Great Debate in the CIO over postwar economic aid to devastated countries and people and the nature of the Marshall Plan, American labor has become increasingly involved in overseas problems and developments. Much of this flows from the real desire among American working people to do something about the sea of poverty in which two-thirds of the world's people still live. At the same time some of this honest concern has been deliberately diverted to place a union label on whatever the State Department and the Pentagon propose.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A labor movement which has no program for change at home can't have sympathy and understanding for the working people of other countries who are taking power into their hands and look to us for help. So they pursue—and pursue aggressively —the goal of turning the clock back. Whether in Africa, the Middle East, Cuba, or South America, the purposes are the same.

World in Explosion

The world is going through an explosion and we shouldn't be surprised to read that it is "anti-American, anti-capitalist, and anti-Western." It will be tough for Americans with the best of intentions and the best of motives to break down the hostility, the suspicion and the hatred built on a hundred years of exploitation and misery. Of all the people in our nation, the working people would have the best chance of being accepted and welcomed in the new revolutionary world; they alone could speak the same language. Yet how can this come about so long as the AFL-CIO pursues its present policies?

Can anyone expect the Cuban workers to welcome a labor movement which publicly endorsed the old leaders of the Batista labor front and now plots to overthrow the Castro regime? Should the workers of Kenya welcome labor intervention and dollars when they see them being used to try to swing an election, and to replace British puppets by American ones? Who argues harder than the AFL-CIO that the first test of a new regime is where it lines up in the East-West struggle rather than what it promises to its own people? Who but George Meany would condemn Nehru and the neutral nations for "serving the cause of Communism?"

WHAT SHOULD A LABOR MOVEMENT BE?

Are we asking too much of the AFL-CIO? Have we set up impossible standards?

An American labor movement should be the democratic expression of the power of millions of workers. It must be American and it must find the solutions and answers right here at home.

We in the ILWU have no blueprint to offer. But, unlike

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the present leaders of the AFL-CIO we have not forgotten what this labor movement is all about, what services it should supply to its members and to all of the American people, and what responsibilities it bears to workers in other lands. No one can claim to have all the answers, but is it too much to demand that the men who sit in labor's high councils begin to ask some of the right questions?

The American labor movement cannot hope to become, as it was twenty-five years ago, the embodiment of the people's power and the means of realizing the people's hopes and aspirations unless it first stops regarding the economic order as a be-all and end-all.

The major elements of a trade union economic program would be the following:

- *The planned use of America's enormous productive plant and human resources to maintain full employment.*
- *The consumption of this output in a higher standard of living and in more leisure at home, spelled out in a shorter work week, earlier retirements, a national health program, adequate housing and urban renewal, and a full measure of education for all.*
- *The use of America's surplus, without strings or qualifications, to aid the development of the two-thirds of the world's people still in poverty.*
- *The reduction in military spending within the framework of negotiated world disarmament.*

Goals such as these cannot be achieved unless the labor movement once more becomes a fighting, rank and file organization. Such a transformed labor movement, dedicated to such an undertaking and prepared to use every bit of strength, energy, and ingenuity available would be on the way to fulfilling its responsibilities to the American people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA AND THE U.S.

BY CHE GUEVARA

The questions below were submitted, in writing, to Comandante Guevara by Leo Huberman during the week of the invasion; the answers were received the end of June.—The Editors

(1) Have relations with the U.S. gone "over the brink" or is it still possible to work out a modus vivendi?

This question has two answers: one, which we might term "philosophical," and the other, "political." The philosophical answer is that the aggressive state of North American monopoly capitalism and the accelerated transition toward fascism make any kind of agreement impossible; and relations will necessarily remain tense or even worse until the final destruction of imperialism. The other, political answer, asserts that these relations are not our fault, and that, as we have many times demonstrated, the most recent time being after the defeat of the Giron Beach landing, we are ready for any kind of agreement on terms of equality with the Government of the United States.

(2) The U.S. holds Cuba responsible for the rupture in relations while Cuba blames the U.S. What part of the blame, in your opinion, can be correctly attributed to your country? In short, what mistakes have you made in your dealings with the U.S.?

Very few, we believe; perhaps some in matters of form. But we hold the firm conviction that we have acted for our part in accord with the right, and that we have responded to the interests of the people in each of our acts. The trouble is that our interests, that is, those of the people, and the interests of the North American monopolies are at variance.

(3) Assuming that the U.S. means to smash the Cuban Revolution, what are the chances of its getting help from the O.A.S. group?

Everything depends on what is meant by "smash." If this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means the violent destruction of the revolutionary regime with the help—likewise direct—of the O.A.S., I believe there is very little possibility, because history cannot be ignored. The countries of America understand the value of active solidarity among friendly countries, and they would not risk a reversal of such magnitude.

(4) Does Cuba align itself in international affairs with the neutralist or Soviet bloc?

Cuba will align herself with justice; or, to be less absolute, with what she takes for justice. We do not practice politics by blocs, so that we cannot side with the neutralist bloc, nor, for the same reason, do we belong to the socialist bloc. But wherever there is a question of defending a just cause, there we will cast our votes—even on the side of the United States if that country should ever assume the role of defending just causes.

(5) What is Cuba's chief domestic problem?

It is difficult to assess problems with such precision. I can mention several: the "guerrillerismo" which still exists in the government; the lack of comprehension on the part of some sectors of the people of the necessity for sacrifice; the lack of some raw materials for industries and some non-durable consumer goods, resulting in certain scarcities; the uncertainty as to when the next imperialist attack will take place; the upsets in production caused by mobilization. These are some of the problems which trouble us at times, but, far from distressing us, they serve to accustom us to the struggle.

(6) How do you explain the growing number of Cuban counter-revolutionaries and the defection of so many former revolutionaries?

Revolutions function by waves. When Mr. Huberman asked this question, perhaps it was accurate, but today there are fewer counter-revolutionaries than before Giron Beach. The counter-revolutionary attack increased slowly until it reached its climax on Giron Beach; then it was defeated and fell drastically to zero. Now that it is again attempting to raise its head and inflict new harm, our intention is to eliminate the counter-revolutionaries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The defections of more or less prominent figures are due to the fact that the socialist revolution left the opportunists, the ambitious, and the fearful far behind and now advances toward a new regime free of this class of vermin.

(7) Can the countries of Latin America solve their problems while maintaining the capitalist system, or must they take the path of socialism as Cuba has done?

It seems elementary to us that the way of the socialist revolution must be chosen, the exploitation of man by man must be abolished, economic planning must be undertaken, and all means of assisting the public welfare must be placed at the service of the community.

(8) Are civil liberties, Western style, permanently finished while your government is in power?

This would depend on what civil rights were referred to —the civil right, for example, of the white to make the Negro sit in the rear of a bus; the right of the white to keep the Negro off a beach or bar him from a certain zone; the right of the Ku Klux Klan to assassinate any Negro who looks at a white woman; the right of a Faubus, in a word, or perhaps the right of a Trujillo, or Somoza, or Stroessner, or Duvalier. In any case, it would be necessary to define the term more precisely, to see if it also includes the right to welcome punitive expeditions sent by a country to the north.

(9) What kind of political system do you envisage for Cuba after the present emergency period of reorganization and reconstruction is over?

In general terms it may be said that a political power which is attentive to the needs of the majority of the people must be in constant communication with the people and must know how to express what the people, with their many mouths, only hint at. How to achieve this is a practical task which will take us some time. In any event, the present revolutionary period must still persist for some time, and it is not possible to talk of structural reorganization while the threat of war still haunts our island.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PREVIEW OF HISTORY?

BY JAMES HIGGINS

It was on Tuesday, March 28, 1961, that I first learned of the existence of a book on guerrilla warfare by Che Guevara. In a report datelined Washington, slugged "Special to The New York Times" and bylined Jack Raymond, I came upon this paragraph:

> The President, according to White House aides, has been profoundly impressed by writings on the subject of guerrilla warfare by Maj. Ernesto Guevara, a Leftist who is Cuban Minister of Industries and was one of Premier Fidel Castro's leading field commanders during the Cuban revolution.

Almost a month later, in the New Auditorium of the Department of State in Washington, about 350 newspaper editors and columnists brought together for instruction on the objectives and problems of U.S. foreign policy, heard a highranking government officer recommend the Guevara book. He said, in effect, "If you folks want to be sure that you know what is going on in Latin America, and indeed in parts of Asia and most of Africa, you should get hold of *Guerrilla Warfare* by Che Guevara, one of the Cuban leaders."

It is pertinent to remark that this State Department conference took place on April 24 and 25, 1961, that is to say, a few days after it was evident that the U.S. government-sponsored invasion of Cuba had done poorly. As I listened to the government officer commend *Guerrilla Warfare,* I wondered if he might not be chastising, in a most discreet way, the military and the Central Intelligence Agency for failure to do their homework with this volume. Or he might have been telling us newspapermen that if we really wanted to know what went wrong—a curiosity that had not been satisfied by any of the very high officials who had talked with us—we might find the answer in *Guerrilla Warfare.*

James Higgins is Assistant Editor of *The Gazette and Daily,* York, Pennsylvania. *Guerrilla Warfare* by Che Guevara was published by MR Press on July 17; price $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now that I have read the book, one of the most significant that MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS has published, I would recommend it in turn to other North Americans. To the leaders and members of the New Party in Canada, for example; to migrant workers; to those directing and planning the struggle for equal rights for colored people; to labor union leaders who are uneasy about the drift of organized labor; to students, particularly, raised on democratic ideals; to intellectuals of all sorts, both poets and scientists; and even to the alienated dissident youngsters whom Paul Goodman writes about in *Growing Up Absurd*.

Che Guevara's book is not a handbook for revolution for North Americans—although it certainly is that, in part, for Latin Americans. But it is an account of a real-life experience of this century through which North Americans, disturbed or frustrated by the emptiness of their society's institutions, might be led to have faith in themselves as they face the power of traditional authority in its institutional setting. *Guerrilla Warfare,* as I read it, is a breath of fresh air, making it possible to believe that men of our day can give life meaning even under the most adverse circumstances.

The immediate message that I think it might convey to "the resistance" in the United States is that all energies ought to be expended at this stage in maintaining and expanding the possibilities of civil debate, of lawful procedure. For guerrilla warfare, however it may be misinterpreted by romantics or reactionaries, is only incidentally a military matter. As Guevara says:

> Guerrilla warfare is a war of the masses, a war of the people. . . . The guerrilla fighter is a social reformer [who] takes up arms responding to the angry protest of the people against their oppressors, [who] fights in order to change the social system that keeps all his unarmed brothers in ignominy and misery.

If you read this metaphorically, keeping in mind the conditions and mood of the United States, you could conclude that the "arms" with which the social reformer fights here now are fact, conviction, and advocacy. But the future, let me hasten to add, depends more upon "the conduct of the authorities"—to use another phrase of Guevara's—than the correct constitutional behavior of reformers. And the conduct of the authorities

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the past twelve or fourteen years—let us omit all reference to McCarthyism and mention only the violent southern opposition to integration plus the ineffectuality of federal law enforcement in this area—has hardly been favorable to the cause of reform by advocacy within a framework of established law. Well, we shall see what we shall see.

One thing is clear at this time, however. In the related fields of equal rights and peace, citizens of the United States are moving into direct action outside of the forms which by tradition have been authorized to convey protest and advocacy. New forms are being created. And they, in turn, are almost immediately challenged by the most sensitive and resolute persons within them. This is the significant social process of the moment, the motion to keep an eye on, I would say.

A friend of mine, whose adult experience has been that of a student and university teacher, compared *Guerrilla Warfare* to a Boy Scout manual, both in its practical advice for life in the open and its moral code. It is true that the book contains considerable detail on such items as shoes, food, clothing, cookfires, weapons, the equipment to be carried in the guerrilla fighter's knapsack, and so forth. (All of this is fascinating to me, by the way, for its simplicity and concreteness; the discipline of the guerrilla is to be extremely selective about material and to use everything with the smallest degree of waste, a discipline that no doubt has a lot to do with Guevara's compact style of writing.) It is true, too, that *Guerrilla Warfare,* explicitly and implicitly, indicates that the guerrilla fighter must develop unassailable qualities of loyalty, trustworthiness, resolution, honor, perseverance, honesty, sobriety, studiousness, and the like. Which does sound something like the Boy Scouts.

But the difference, as I tried to explain to my friend, is in the relationship of the guerrilla fighter to the whole human reality of which he is a part. All at once, in the midst of revolution, words which have become embarrassing to those of us who have learned the corruption of commercial values, suddenly take on life. They become real. And they do so because they are given meaning by the personal behavior of those who employ them. Nor are they abstracted from a moral code imposed from on high. Loyalty and honesty are indispensable in guerrilla

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warfare because they are functional. They are as necessary to the success at which the fighters are aiming as salt, hammocks, and ammunition.

I will never forget reading in *The New York Times,* a day or so after Batista had fled and the guerrilla fighters led by Fidel Castro had moved into Havana, a quoted remark by U.S. Ambassador Earl Smith, which was something to the effect that he marveled at the quiet and sturdy efficiency with which administrative responsibilities had been assumed. All the background to Mr. Smith's amazement—from which, to be sure, he soon recovered once it became clear that the revolutionaries were not only efficient but determined on basic changes in the Cuban political, social, and economic system—is to be found in *Guerrilla Warfare* in the description of the kind of men (and women, too) the fighters in the Sierra Maestra made of themselves. One can learn also of the long experience the revolutionaries had already had in administration before they got to Havana. At every successful expansion of guerrilla-controlled territory, a civil administration was instituted, complete with penal and civil code, a central department of justice, rules for agrarian reform, and whatever else the local situation required.

The more one considers the hard substance of this short book, the more vast seems the gap between general United States understanding and realities south of the border. Perhaps, if enough persons read this translation by J. P. Morray of Guevara's Spanish-language text, the task of filling in the gap will have been started. But I don't know. I sometimes feel that a very large class of North Americans has lost the capacity to respond to a sentence like this: "[The guerrilla fighter] is ready to give his life, but the positive quality of this guerrilla warfare is that each one of the guerrilla fighters is ready to die, not to defend an ideal, but rather to convert it into reality."

And yet, at the same time that I am baffled at the problem of communication in the United States, I get to thinking of the revolutions to come in Latin America and of the need for North Americans at least to make a try at preparing their minds for the events. Maybe in future years *Guerrilla Warfare* will be looked upon as a brilliant preview of the history of the Americas in the second half of the twentieth century. Remember the remark of Walter Lippmann in his CBS interview with Howard K.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smith? I am quoting from memory but it was along these lines: "The real danger of the Cuban Revolution is that he [Castro] will solve problems which have never yet been solved in Latin America."

All the dependable information I can get convinces me that these problems are being solved in Cuba. And it's logical, isn't it, to suppose that the news of Cuba is getting out to the rest of Latin America, to such as that dying twelve-year-old kid of Brazil, I think, whose unforgettable face was in *Life* a while ago? Well, if that's the case, we North Americans would do well to read and ponder *Guerrilla Warfare,* not as a model for tactics and strategy to be mechanically applied, say, in Laos, but as a primer for understanding much of the world around us—as well as a book by a man whose words ring deeply and humanly true—rooted, as they are, in the revolutionary experience of real social life.

For a number of years I have been more and more concerned with the question of human energy, its waste and its release. Let me give an idea of the stages through which this concern has appeared to me. I do this not for personal reasons but only to sketch an American environment that must be somewhat typical, an environment that contains the elements which raise the human energy question—and the question of the purposes of energy, if not of life itself.

First as a really ignorant student, then as a floater in literary and magazine affairs, next as a shipyard worker, a union member, an employe of an industrial union, a writer, reporter, editor, part-time teacher, welfare executive, husband and father through most of this period, family man therefore, friend of psychiatrists and lawyers, amateur actor, reader and thinker, admirer of poets, painters, and jazz musicians, acquaintance of politicians, I have kept wondering, with the pace always increasing, about the presence of forces in human nature that, activated, can open up limitless possibilities.

It was the sense of this activation, remotely perceived, that attracted me to the Cuban Revolution. Now that I have read Guevara's *Guerrilla Warfare* I feel sure my intuition was all right. The guerrilla fighters were and are, I guess, the agent creating the opportunity for millions of Cubans to put their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

energies to good use. Where this energy flows—into land reform, education, industrialization, health techniques, dancing, singing, theatre, political discussion, house construction—is a matter of need and chance. The main thing is the loosening of the social and psychological manacles of the people, so that energy is liberated to perform the miracles of which all human beings are capable. The Cuban guerrillas, who first liberated themselves, showed the way. That, to me, is the import of their work as I find it defined in this remarkable book by Che Guevara.

A DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE

BY AMERICAN ARTISTS AND WRITERS

The people of Revolutionary Cuba have the right to determine their own destiny without intervention from the United States Government.

We believe that by financing, arming, training Cuban emigres and planning and participating in the invasion of April 17, 1961, the United States Government *has* intervened and *has* committed an act of Aggression against the people of Cuba.

We believe that the invasion of April 17, and the continuing aggressive attitude of our government endangers not only the people of Cuba and the cause of world peace, but also our own freedom as Americans. President Kennedy's request that the press engage in self-censorship continues the process of suppression and regimentation of American life under the guise of "fighting the Cold War." It is not a coincidence that acts of hostility towards Revolutionary Cuba culminating in the April invasion have been greeted enthusiastically by the Official Liberals of the Establishment, as well as by militarists, big business and its press, southern racists and McCarthyites.

If we are to safeguard freedom in America, we must do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all in our power to oppose and prevent further aggression against the people of Revolutionary Cuba.

Signers:

C. V. J. Anderson
Dore Ashton
Bill Berkson
Wallace Berman
Walter Bowe
Kay Boyle
Jean Brodey
Nick Cernovitch
Remy Charlip
Alfred Chester
Charles Childs
Rhoda Clark
Hettie Cohen
Bruce Conner
Robert Corless
Philip Comar
Anthony Cox
Emilio Cruz
Diane Di Prima
Richard Di Prima
Edward Dorn
Richard Duerden
Stephen Durkee
Bob Farren
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Max Finstein
Stanley Fisher
John Fles
Mary Frank
Leo Garen
Sidney Geist
Richard Gibson
Allen Ginsberg
Ann Guidici
Joyce Glassman
Paul Goodman
Donald Hall
Bobb Hamilton
Al Hansen
Peter Hartman
Bob Hauge
Fred Herko
Ted Joans
Eddie Johnson
Lester Johnson
Ray Johnson
Steve Jonas
LeRoi Jones
Bob Kaufman
Elaine de Kooning
Seymour Krim
Tuli Kupferberg
Ellen Lapidus
Jeremy Larner
Naomi Levine
Ron Loewinsohn
Lee Lozano
Boris Lurie
Norman Mailer
Edward Marshall
Joan Mathews
Julian Mayfield
Nancey McDonald
John H. McDowell
Leroy McLucas
Jonas Mekas
David Meltzer
Warren Miller
Liam O'Gallagher
Joel Oppenheimer
Peter Orlovsky
David Ossman
Aileen Passloff
Tom Perry
Janine Pommy
George Preston
W. Zev Putterman
Dachine Rainer
Margaret Randall
Irving Rosenthal
Robert Scheer
Marc Schleifer
Abram Schlemowitz
Howard Schulman
Richard Seaver
Archie Shepp
Linda Sidon
Alvin Simon
John Simon
W. D. Snodgrass
Harriet Sohmers
David Solomon
Michelle Stuart
A. B. Spellman
George Stanley
Elizabeth Sutherland
Bob Thompson
Julius Tobias
Ed Travers
Luther Van
Esteban Vicente
Larry Wallrich
David R. Wang
Bill Ward
James Waring
Philip Whalen
William A. White
Judith Wilson
Pantali Xantos
Athos Zacharias
Marian Zazeela

Any artists and writers who wish to add their names to this "Declaration of Conscience" may still do so. Letters should be addressed to the Declaration of Conscience Committee, 153 Avenue C, New York 9, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

A Spectre Haunts Washington

Somewhat more than a century ago, in 1848, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto, in which this sentence appeared: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism." The "spectre" of 1848 became a full-blown political movement after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Today it takes its place side by side with industrialization, war, and nationalism as one of four potent forces that are undermining capitalist imperialism and promoting the building of socialism.

The spectre that haunted Europe in 1848 is the chief preoccupation of the Capitol and the White House in Washington. The Senate has just gone on record 76 to 0 against the diplomatic recognition of Communist China; the State Department has declared that "communism is not negotiable"; the President, in his April 20 speech to the newspaper publishers said: "The forces of communism are not to be underestimated in Cuba or anywhere else in the world." "This nation, in concert with all the free nations of this hemisphere, must take an ever closer and more realistic look at the menace of external communist intervention in Cuba." "It is clearer than ever that we face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe." "Cuba must not be abandoned to the Communists."

This formulation of the issue was made explicit at the time of the Russian Revolution. It has been stated with increasing clarity through the years that saw not merely the survival of the Soviet Government but its multiplying successes in such diverse fields as economic and social planning, resource conservation, the output of producer and consumer goods in peace-time and of military hardware and supplies in wartime, improved public health, general and technical education, sport, scientific research, aeronautics, and other areas.

Principles and techniques of socialist construction have spread beyond the Soviet Union into East Europe and Asia. They have attracted attention and won growing respect in Latin America and Africa. From small tentative beginnings, the build-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of socialism has become a planet-wide movement within a single generation. At the outbreak of war in 1914, socialism was still a theory and a theme for propagandists. Until war's end in 1945 it was largely confined to one country. Today nearly half of the human race lives in countries that are planning and building socialism. The spectre of 1848 was a shadow, a tentative promise of things to come, compared with the full-bodied world-girdling movement that has gained a foothold on every continent except Australasia.

Prime Minister Churchill warned of "the menace" at his Fulton, Missouri, speech in 1946. President Truman embodied the warning in the Truman Doctrine of 1947. It was reiterated and put into local practice by President Eisenhower. President Kennedy has made anti-Communism the pivotal center of his policy. As the Communist sector has developed economically and socially and spread geographically it has attracted more attention and aroused greater concern among the practitioners of capitalist imperialism, reaching its most hysterical levels of alarm and fear in those Washington circles most closely associated with the formulating and implementing of United States policy.

Another Spectre Haunts New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and Detroit:

the spectre of creeping economic stagnation. United States business is resigned to the boom and bust of the business cycle, fortifying itself with the questionable assumption that each bust will be succeeded by a boom on a higher level than its predecessor. Ten years of stagnation which followed the 1929 bust confronted the "higher-ever-higher" boys with a big question mark and shook public confidence in their reliability. Big Business countered with three propositions. *First*: Big Business is no longer capitalism in its raw 19th century form, but a people's capitalism owned by millions of stockholders and administered in their interest and for their benefit. *Second*: Busts have their good points, squeezing out the water of speculation; pulling workers off their highwage horses and putting them where they belong, and thus countering the trend toward inflation. *Third*: If it is really desirable to flatten out boom-bust cycles, this can be done by building stabilizers or shock absorbers into the economy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sixteen years have passed since the war's end in 1945; three decades since the onset of the Great Depression in 1929. Four times during the past sixteen years (in 1949, 1953, 1957, 1960) United States economy has turned from expansion to contraction; from boom to bust. Post-war boom-bust cycles have been short, averaging about four years over-all. But this was the norm of 1815-1914, when some 25 business cycles occurred in 100 years—again the four year average.

After the boastful talk about riding and taming the business cycle, the experts who set out to do the jobs are flat on their backs, while boom-bust continues to play ducks and drakes with the economy. Despite the economic stabilizers and shock absorbers, boom-bust cycles still follow their long established pattern.

Beside the boom-bust cycle, four other depressing features nag the supporters and beneficiaries of United States private enterprise. Most damning of the four is the inescapable fact that United States economy instead of growing is stagnating. Over the post-war years, the rate of growth has slowed to about two percent a year, or the equivalent of the growth rate in the population. In other words, the real economic growth is not growth at all. An economy may expand or decline or stagnate. It cannot stand still. Accumulating bits of evidence point to stagnation as the outstanding feature of United States economy.

Other evidence points beyond stagnation to decline. Early in 1961 over half the industrial areas of the United States were listed as "distressed,"—having a body of unemployed in excess of six percent of the working force. Important and long established segments of the economy such as shipbuilding, coal mining, metal mining, steel making, and auto production were among the areas named by the Federal Department of Labor as "distressed."

Significance attaches to these developments because at the turn of the century Great Britain, the mother of present-day industrialization, passed through a similar experience, with overdeveloped productive capacity, idle plant, and unemployed workers as permanent features of some of the same basic industries that are presently flying distress signals in the United States.

A third example of decline in the United States economy is the bankruptcy of agriculture. A state of bankruptcy exists in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an economic enterprise whose income is less than outgo so persistently that the enterprise is unable to meet its obligations from its own resources. United States agriculture has been in this predicament for decades. Year after year the Federal Government pours in subsidies to prop up private enterprise farming. During the past year the farm program has cost the Federal Treasury about six billion dollars. This charge is being met by United States tax payers not because of drought, flood, or other natural calamity, but because this key area of the economy is still organized on a horse-and-buggy basis in an era of power-age economy.

Fourth among the instances of decline in United States economy is the growing number of chronically unemployed. In boom years the number of workless drops to three or four million. In post-war bust years it rises to five or six million. Since the end of the war, in 1945, unemployment has risen cyclically and persistently. Partly this rise is due to the growth of productive capacity in excess of domestic and foreign market demand. Partly it is due to the wide-spread investment of capital surpluses in labor-replacing machinery (automation).

Such symptoms of persistent economic stagnation and decline inside the United States are hardly less alarming than the survival and spread of Communism abroad. They are particularly significant in view of the fact that the stability and security of any nation rests upon the health and solvency of its economy.

Build Up Toward War

Before Washington's new administration could launch its program for permanent prosperity at home and peace and progress abroad, it was forced to deal with the twin threats of economic stagnation and Communist expansion. How was this to be done? Experience during the 1930's in Italy, Japan, and Germany and in three wars—1914, 1939, and 1950, suggested an obvious answer—a build-up toward war. The Eisenhower administration toyed with the idea of war in Cuba. The Kennedy administration tried it. Both administrations checked on the possibilities of war over Laos and over Berlin.

U.S. News in its July 31, 1961 issue listed the steps which Washington was taking in preparation for hot war:

Armed forces are to be strengthened in the world's key areas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of danger—Western Europe and the Far East. At home . . . the President is talking of getting the country set for at least five years of heightened effort. Draft calls are to be increased and recruiting intensified. Orders already have been issued to States to increase the pool of 'draft ready' men from 70,000 to 100,000. . . . Arms spending will go up sharply, both to take care of added manpower and to add to the vast array of weapons and other supplies that the armed forces must have to face the prospect of combat. Billions are required to provide the Army with modern weapons.

President Kennedy made a special television appeal on July 25 for the mobilization of military manpower and an increase of three and a half billion dollars in 1961-62 military appropriations. His appeal met with an affirmative bi-partisan response in both houses of Congress. Big business answered the call by a surge of buying on the New York Stock Exchange. The *New York Times* of August 2 headed its stock exchange story "Market Climbs to Record Highs." The story stated: "The forward movement actually began last Tuesday on the eve of President Kennedy's television address to the nation calling for a military build up in the face of the Berlin crisis."

True to the policy formula in his April 20 talk to the newspaper publishers, the President did not invoke the machinery of the United Nations, nor did he propose negotiation or compromise. Like President Truman in Korea and President Eisenhower in Lebanon he turned to the military, relying upon the threat of force and violence as the handiest and readiest means of dealing with international controversy.

U.S. News on July 31 headed its story on the political outlook over Berlin: "Build Up Toward War?" We feel that the question mark should be omitted. The first six months of Mr. Kennedy's presidency prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that he will follow in the footsteps of his two predecessors and use war and the threat of war as the mainstay of United States foreign policy.

The Next Twenty Years

There are several ways of moving ahead into the future. The way of expediency and extemporizing was suggested by President F. D. Roosevelt's method: "Let's try it!" The way of collective planning and programming is followed in the remark-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able Soviet Draft Program prepared for submission to the Russian Communist Party's October Conference.

The Draft Program begins with the assumption that the chief centers of world wealth and power are being transformed from capitalism through socialism into Communism. A review of world history during the four decades since the Russian Revolution of 1917 provides ample support for the correctness of this assumption, especially from the experience of Europe and Asia.

Only incidentally is the Draft Program concerned with historical generalizations. The body of the document is devoted to a detailed statement of the tasks which face the Soviet Union in its efforts to build a Communist society. Not only must Soviet economy be planned, organized, and mechanized to insure greater production with less waste, but natural resources must be conserved and where possible augmented to provide for the Soviet peoples higher standards of living, improved working conditions, and better means for converting nature's bounty into both means of production and consumer goods and services.

Further, the Draft Program emphasises the urgent need for peaceful coexistence, since another general war would not only be a calamity for mankind everywhere, but would retard or postpone socialist construction.

The *New York Times* on August 1st printed the Tass translation of the Soviet Communist Party's Draft Program in a special eight page supplement. The same paper carried an editorial headed "The New Communist Manifesto," in which the draft program is described as "a new declaration of war against the free world—military, political, economic and propagandistic war." This description is inaccurate if not untrue.

The real purpose of the Draft Program is not to destroy capitalism but to demonstrate a pattern of life which will provide more good things for more people than have been available under capitalism.

The Draft Program challenges socialist countries to outdo capitalism during the next twenty years in providing mankind with opportunities for enlightenment, health, and well being never achieved during the centuries of world domination by capitalist imperialism. Such an achievement would convince peoples everywhere that socialism offers more hope for the peace and happiness of mankind than was possible under capitalism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just off the press . . .

J. P. Morray

FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT

Cold War Debate

Who kept and who violated the Yalta Agreement? Who started the cold war and why? Who was to blame for the failure to reach agreement on controlling the use of atomic energy? Who is to blame for the continuing arms race? Why has there been no agreement to ban nuclear testing? These are some of the momentous questions on which this book sheds new light.

Bibliography, notes, index, 384 pages

$8.50 With sub or renewal, $11.00

■

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS

333 Sixth Avenue N. Y. 14

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do you have friends who are still confused about the situation in Cuba and Latin America? You can help clarify their thinking with our

CUBA PACKET

consisting of four recent issues of MR plus the pamphlet "Reflections on the Cuban Revolution" by Paul A. Baran.

(1) **March MR**
"New Labels For Old Products"—The Editors
"Which Way For Latin America?"—Leo Huberman

(2) **May MR**
"The Criminal Invasion Plan"—The Editors
(Written BEFORE it happened)

(3) **June MR**
"The Kennedy Doctrine"—The Editors
"The Truth About Cuba"—Leo Huberman
"An Interview With General Cardenas"
—Harvey O'Connor
"Letter To The United Nations"—Lazaro Cardenas
"World Events"—Scott Nearing

(4) **July-August MR**
Double issue entirely devoted to this crucial question

(5) **"Reflections on the Cuban Revolution"**—Enlarged 48-page pamphlet by Paul A. Baran

That's the Cuba Packet

5 Information Packed Items All for the special price of $2

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still Another MR PRESS Reprint of

MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS

by LEO HUBERMAN

Here's what the critics said about this book which has sold over half a million copies in many languages:

HAROLD LASKI

"No one can read this book and ever again say that history is dull."

MAX LERNER

"Mr. Huberman has achieved an authentic miracle. He has traced the development of economic history simply, clearly, and fluidly. . . . a brilliant piece of work."

THE *NEW YORKER*

"The most successful attempt to date to humanize the Dismal Science and link the history of man to the history of economic theory."

THE LONDON *ECONOMIST*

"An exciting blend of economic history and economic theory. . . . Brilliantly and lucidly written with a wealth of scholarly references."

THE *NATION*

"No other book can give to the reader so much of its subject in so limited a space."

LIBRARY JOURNAL

"MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS is an event. It makes of economics a subject interesting, stimulating, and provocative."

THE *NEW REPUBLIC*

"The best single-volume work on the subject currently available. . . . a brilliant book."

F. P. A. in *THE CONNING TOWER*

"I doff my bonnets, hats, and hoods
To Leo Huberman's WORLDLY GOODS."

Paperback, $1.75 **Bibliography, index, 349 pages**

Monthly Review Press **333 Sixth Avenue** **New York 14, N. Y.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

In its third MR Press printing is *Man's Worldly Goods* by Leo Huberman (see page 240). This history of economic theory has become a classic in the field of radical literature, having sold over half a million copies in many languages. From Japan, where a few years ago it was the biggest-selling foreign book, comes this letter which gives a clue to the reason for its popularity:

> Recently I read your *Man's Worldly Goods* in a Japanese translation. First of all, I was surprised that your sentences were very easy. So I understood the history of capitalist economy as if I had read an interesting novel. I've read a lot of economics because my major is economics. But I've never read such an interesting book of economics as yours.
>
> I hope you one thing. Please grant my request. I hope for correspondence with a progressive collegian of America. Would you mind introducing to me an advanced collegian you know?
>
> My name is Tatsuo Saito. I'm a 21-year old boy, a sophomore at Jōchi University, majoring in economics.

The English is "quaint" but how many of us could do as well in the Japanese language? Those "advanced collegians" among our readers who wish to write to Mr. Saito should address him at 1235, Shimane-cho, Adachi-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Every now and then we guess wrong about the number of extra copies of an issue we will need. It doesn't matter too much when we find ourselves with overs, but it does matter when we are short because then we can't fill orders from universities which keep MR on file. Right now we are short of two recent issues—September 1960 and January 1961; that is, volume 12, numbers 5 and 9. If you can supply copies in good condition of either or both of these issues, please mail them to Monthly Review, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y. We will give you in return any MR pamphlet you want, or add a month to your subscription—whichever you specify.

From time to time we get requests from new readers for "a complete set of bound copies of MR from its inception to date." Each year we bind 50 sets of MR in beautiful wine color with gold lettering on the spine. The bound volumes vary in price depending on how scarce they have become and the cost of the issues in each particular volume. The prices are: Volumes 1, 3, and 4—$10 each; Volume 2—$15 (only three left); Volumes 5 through 11—$7 each; and Volume 12 (the latest one)—$10; the complete set—$104. If you can afford it, what better worthwhile present could you give your local library?

Our letter of the month, just received:

> I have just recently become acquainted with your profound and lucid monthly magazine; for the first time I have read a political publication that is truly sensible. It is with great pleasure that I wlll begin to procure the books that you publish. To begin with, please send me Che Guevara's *Guerrilla Warfare*.

For a complete list of MR Press books, with money-saving combination offers, see the back cover.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub
AMERICAN RADICALS edited by Harvey Goldberg, paper	$1.25	$ 6.00
AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE Bert Cochran, Ed., paper	1.25	6.00
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman, paper	1.75	6.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy paper cloth	1.75 3.50	6.00 7.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara	3.50	7.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn	3.50	7.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb	3.50	7.00
THE JAZZ SCENE by Francis Newton	4.00	8.00
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	8.00
CONVICTION edited by Norman MacKenzie	4.00	8.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden	5.00	8.00
THE PRESENT AS HISTORY by Paul M. Sweezy	5.00	8.00
THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler	5.00	8.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran	5.00	8.00
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams	5.00	8.00
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	9.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley	6.75	10.00
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	10.00
FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT: COLD WAR DEBATE by J. P. Morray	8.50	11.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED